

**Interview Summary**

|                                      |                                   |                         |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Application No.<br><b>09/667,807</b> | Applicant(s)                      | Darty                   |
|                                      | Examiner<br><b>Fritz Alphonse</b> | Art Unit<br><b>2675</b> |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Fritz Alphonse (PTO)

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) George Simeon (Applicant's Representative)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Apr 28, 2003

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims 1 and 23.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kuwahara (U.S. Pat. No. 6,486,866) and Palmer (U.S. Pat. No. 6,052,287).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Distinction between the claimed invention and the prior art have been discussed. Applicant's Representative argues that Kuwahara (U.S. Pat. No. 6,486,866) fails to teach about the limitation " a controller that moves the at least one particle along the direction of extention of the at least one channel ". The arguments presented seem to overcome the prior art rejection since Kuwahara's micro-capsules 6 are fixed between the substrates (see col. 11, lines 22-32). The Applicant's Representative requests for Reconsideration. The Examiner will conduct further search upon reception of that request.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required